

REMARKS

The present *Amendment and Request for Reconsideration* is filed in response to the Office Action mailed on 19 September 2005. In the present amendment, the Applicant amends claims 1-14 and adds new claims 16-21. The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the application as amended.

The Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been entered by such amendment; amended claims 1-14 and new claims 16-21 are fully supported by the application as originally filed. New claims 16-21 are merely directed to wireless device, method, and host server claims of the present invention.

In the Office Action mailed on 19 September 2005, the Examiner rejected claims of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 103(a) based on U.S. Patent Application Publication US2002/0165012 to Kirbas et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,081,731 to Boltz et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,678,195 to Suikkola et al. In response, the Applicant respectfully submit that the claims as amended are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the following reasons.

In contrast with the present application, the technology focus in Boltz et al. is that of "Selective Carrier Denial" (SCD) (e.g. see 1:30-55) which is specifically used to prohibit long distance service for non-paying subscribers (e.g. see 1:39). Boltz et al. teach the denial of all toll calls or toll calls associated with one or more particular *carriers* (e.g. AT&T, Sprint, etc.) associated with a wireless device. The information utilized to achieve this may include *carrier* identification information (e.g. see 4:45-53).

In contrast, the present application is directed to restricting *particular* long distance telephone calls made from a wireless communication device. The long distance restriction information includes information indicative of one or more allowable/disallowable *country codes or area codes*. Preferably, these restrictions are provided through use of a host computer and memory database of a *private network*

outside of the wireless network within which the wireless device operates. For example, the long distance call restrictions may be managed by an IT department of a corporation which has authority or control over the wireless device.

Boltz et al. do not teach or suggest the use of one or more allowable/disallowable *country codes or area codes* of a telephone number to provide long distance call restrictions. An attempt to place any toll call through use of dialed digits "10" (see 5:47-51) is not the same as providing long distance call restrictions based on country codes and area codes. The teachings of the prior art are not selective or as refined as that taught by the present application; no reason to provide such selectivity is apparent as the techniques are simply utilized to deny service. Further, Boltz et al. do not teach or suggest the use of a host computer and memory database of a private network outside the wireless network (e.g. managed by an IT department) for maintaining storage of long distance restriction information which includes such allowable/disallowable country codes or area codes.

The teachings of Kirbas et al. cannot be combined with the teachings of Boltz et al. as suggested by the Examiner, as there is no adequate suggestion or motivation to do so. In particular, there is no adequate suggestion or motivation to use area codes for the SCD feature of Boltz et al. If combined, the primary intent of Boltz et al. (i.e. the selective carrier denial feature) would be defeated. It is an important objective to implement the SCD feature in Boltz et al. (see e.g. 1:30-55).

Further, the teachings of Suikkola et al. cannot be combined with the teachings of Kirbas et al. as suggested by the Examiner. The description support for Kirbas et al. teach nothing about a host server of any communication network utilized in connection with the wireless device, let alone any private communication network. There is no adequate suggestion or motivation to combine the references of Kirbas et al. and Suikkola et al. In Suikkola et al., there is no adequate teaching of use of a database of a host server of "a private communication network which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates" (see e.g. the Abstract of Suikkola et al. at lines 5-8: "the facility data for a given subscriber station are read from the

subscriber data base of the radio system and the data are sent as a facility data message through a base station...").

The present invention as defined by at least some of the claims is advantageous over the prior art of record in that *private* control may be provided for restricting long distance calls, separate from the governing wireless network, in a flexible and convenient manner for private entities such as companies and corporations.


Other arguments for patentability are apparent but considered moot in light of the arguments already presented.

Again, the Applicant request entry of the *Amendment* and reconsideration of the claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that the application as amended is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Thank you. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Date: 19 Dec 2005

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN J. OSKOREP
Reg. No. 41,234

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ.
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER
980 N. MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611

Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 214-6303